



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

first glance what we are to expect. SKEAT, DOUSE, G. STEPHENS, "the great Runologist," have given "their latest views," and likewise the inevitable MAX MÜLLER, who, we are sure, would be loath to assume the responsibility for half the statements here presented. But very few of the names of scholars deserving to be known to the beginner are met with; and even when such authorities are quoted our authors betray their inability to discriminate between utterances of weight and the opinions of men whose productions are suited to awaken only an antiquarian interest. It would be as impossible as it is unnecessary to point out all the errors in the pages before us, and we shall not endeavor to convince the authors by any marshalling of evidence; a remark or two upon the treatment of a portion of the subject, and a few quotations, without comment (out of many that would serve), will suffice to make it appear that this book is valueless, nay even pernicious, in the hands of the beginner—for whom it is designed.

It may be premised that the Goths are here again connected with the Getae. Chief argument: the Greek origin of the old runic alphabet, transmitted by the Getae to the Goths and thence spread to the northern Germanic tribes! LENORMANT has the honor to be placed by the side of WIMMER; the views of both are briefly rejected.—The following quotations may illustrate the authors' preparation in comparative philology:—P. 3. "The divergence of the vowel in *Gut* and *Getae* recalls that in Gothic *kuni*, *muns*, *tunth*, as compared with *γένος*, *mens*, *dens*."—P. 26. "In Gothic we have such double forms as *Gaius* and *Caius*."—P. 28. n. 1. "Thus we have *ak* for Goth. *ik* on the Vappby stone, with the older vowel as in Sk. *aham*." On page 31 Goth. *bairan bairais* etc., are compared with Sk. *bhareyam*, *bhares*, etc., and this is preceded by the remark "that the Sanskrit *e* is the equivalent of *ai*, and that Greek and Gothic *ai* had a sound very similar to it."—P. 41. "Modern German is strangely eccentric with regard to this *au* as is seen on comparing Goth. *haubiths*, *nauths*, *dauhtar*, with *haupt*, *nôth*, *töchter*."

One might expect that the more practical part of the grammar would be given satisfac-

torily and without the blunders with which the rest of the work swarms, though the specimens given above are enough to indicate the hopeless confusion of the article on Gothic sounds. Even the inflection is not stated correctly; the declension alone contains the following errors: acc. pl. *fiskaus* instead of *fiskans* (misprint?); gen. sing. *andbahteis* for *andbahtjis*, the more regular form; *laiseins* follows the *i*-declension in the dat., acc. pl., not the *o*-stems; *hairto*, as a neuter, forms the acc. sg. *hairto* not *hairtin*. The rule on p. 48 is incorrect: "stems in *ra* suppress the *s* of the nom. when *r* follows a vowel . . . but the *s* is retained when *r* follows a consonant."

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Deseret.

Undine. Eine Erzählung von FRIEDRICH BARON DE LA MOTTE FOUQUÉ. Edited with an introduction, notes and vocabulary by HANS C. G. VON JAGEMANN, New York: Henry Holt & Co.

The republication of FOUQUÉ's 'Undine'—it had appeared before in the *Unterhaltungsbibliothek* by the same firm—is a good illustration of the rapid advance instruction in modern languages has been making in this country, and of the higher claims that publishers now feel constrained to impose on the scholarship and pedagogical skill of their editors.

PROF. VON JAGEMANN's edition is excellent in every respect. The introduction contains a brief sketch of FOUQUÉ's life and literary activity, and a succinct account of the Romantic school. The editor's care in the preparation of the text and the notes leaves very little to be corrected or suggested.—On the note to p. 42, l. 25, we read: "*deren einen sie ihrem Bräutigam gab und den andern für sich behielt*"; an irregular construction; if the clause after *und* is still dependent on the relative *deren*, *andern* should not be preceded by the article," etc. We doubt whether this is correct German. *Deren* ought to be repeated before *andern* without the article or *von denen* be substituted for the partitive *deren*: *von denen sie einen—und den andern*, etc. Or, still better because more idiomatic, changing the whole construction: *während sie den*

andern, etc.—On P. 108, l. 16, *in welchem treue Seele lebt*, since there is no reference made to the omission of the indefinite article, this may be supposed to be a misprint for *eine treue Seele*, as it stands in the former edition.—Slight errors in the references are: 24, 17 for 23, 17 (note to 31, 22); 4, 27 for 4, 29 (note to 62, 1).

In the preface the statement is made that "Undine is generally read early in the course." What is to be understood by "early" is rather indefinite, and the word was doubtless intended to be taken *cum grano salis*; but it seems to be sound doctrine to emphasize that 'Undine' should scarcely be taken up before the class has read some of the classics of average difficulty. FOUQUÉ's style, the conception of the characters, the action and development in 'Undine,' are such as to afford a profitable exercise in style and literature for the more mature student.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Deseret.

PARASITIC I IN OLD FRENCH AND PROVENÇAL.

Die Quellen des parasitischen i im altfranzösischen von E. WALDNER. Freiburger Diss. Braunschweig, Westermann, 1887, pp. 40.

Das parasitische i im Alt- und Neuprovenzalischen von H. SABERSKY. Freiburger Diss. Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1888, pp. 47.

The former of the above-mentioned dissertations presents a praiseworthy and exhaustive investigation into the sources of the so-called parasitic *i*, i. e., "dasjenige *i*, das sich bei der Umbildung des Lateinischen zum Französischen aus einer, sei es primären, sei es sekundär entstandenen palatalen Konsonanz entwickelt hat, und mit dem benachbarten Vokal zum Diphthong verschmolzen ist. Das parasitische *i* kann an den der Konsonanz unmittelbar vorausgehenden oder an den ihr unmittelbar folgenden Vokal herangetreten sein, oder es kann sich auch beiden Vokalen je ein solches *i* zugesellt haben, z. B. PACAS: *paies*, CARUM: *chier*, PACARE: *pai-ier*."

Accordingly the author makes two broad divisions of his subject: *a*, where the parasitic *i* is joined to the preceding vowel; *b*, where it

is joined to the following vowel. *A* is again subdivided into two chapters, I, parasitic *i*=intervocalic *c, g, j*; II, parasitic *i* developed from a compound palatal consonant.

SABERSKY follows closely the same general plan and manner of arrangement as WALDNER; but the dissertation before us is only part of a work entitled 'Zur provenzalischen Lautlehre (parasitisches *i* und die damit zusammenhängenden Erscheinungen),' which he promises to publish ere long.

In the case of parasitic *i*=intervocalic *c, g, j*, we have to do with a process of assimilation of palatal *c, g* to the surrounding vowels (*c>g>j>i*); velar *c, g* falls without trace (SECURUM > *seur*). The series *precas: preies: prieis: pries* (p. 7) is misleading, *prieis* being no doubt a misprint for *prieies*. That WALDNER's explanation (p. 8) of *-ūca>ue* (with simple falling of *c*) is correct, is proved by VERRUCA > Prov. *berrugo*, etc. (SABERSKY, p. 15). SCHWAN, 'Grammatik des Altfranzösischen,' § 36,4, supposes a change of suffix *-uca>-uta*. Why is VAGINA > *ga-ine* said to be irregular? The word has developed as FAGINAM > *faine*, SAGIMEN > *sain*, REGINAM > *reine*; the *y* coming from *ġ* has united with the *ī* that followed (cf. HORNING, 'La Langue et la littérature françaises,' § 144, b; SCHWAN, 'Gram.' § 173). Before *ē* it formed with *ei* the triphthong *iei*, which was reduced to *i*; SAGENA > *seine*, PAGENSIS > *pa-ieis* > *païs*. For the last-mentioned word this pronunciation is demanded by grammarians as late as MAIGRET (cf. THUROT, 'De la prononciation française' i, p. 501). The contamination of *a* by the parasitic *i* must here have taken place at a much later period.

The second chapter treats of the parasitic *i* developed from a group of consonants, in which one element was *c, g, j* or *ġ*. It was THOMSEN, "L'*i* parasite et les consonnes mouillées en français," *Mém. d. l. soc. d. ling. d. Paris*, iii, pp. 106-123, who first applied to French the principle formulated by SIEVERS, *Verhandlungen der 28. Versammlung deutscher Philologen*, Leipzig, 1873, p. 190 (and later, 'Grundzüge der Phonetik,' § 23 and p. 238): "Kein Vokal kann über einen oder mehrere Konsonanten direct einen Einfluss auf einen anderen ausüben, sondern stets ist